

Evolution of the N -ion Jaynes-Cummings model beyond the standard rotating wave approximation

P. Aniello¹, A. Porzio² *and S. Solimeno²

Dipartimento di Scienze Fisiche, Università di Napoli “Federico II”
and

¹Istituto Nazionale di Fisica Nucleare, Sezione di Napoli

²”Coherentia” - INFN, Unità di Napoli

Complesso Universitario Monte Sant’Angelo,
via Cintia, I-80126 Napoli, Italy.

February 1, 2008

Abstract

A unitary transformation of the N -ion Jaynes-Cummings Hamiltonian is proposed. It is shown that any approximate expression of the evolution operator associated with the *transformed Hamiltonian* retains its validity independently from the intensity of the external driving field. In particular, using the rotating wave approximation, one obtains a solution for the N -ion Jaynes-Cummings model which improves the standard rotating wave approximation solution.

1 Introduction

The classical Jaynes-Cummings model (JCM)[1], with Hamiltonian

$$H_{JC} = \nu a^\dagger a + \frac{1}{2} \omega_{ge} \sigma_z + \Omega_R (a \sigma_+ + a^\dagger \sigma_-),$$

has become, so to say, the drosophila of quantum optics, since it gives a simple description of the main properties of many physical systems consisting of atoms in interaction with electromagnetic fields [2]. For instance, it has been for long at center of the attention for the study of laser cooling of ions placed in parabolic traps [3][4]. The main features of some approximate solutions of the JCM have been extensively studied, in particular the ‘collapse and revival’ phenomenon [5][6].

*Alberto Porzio, tel:+39-081-676233; fax:+39-081-676346, e-mail: alberto.porzio@na.infn.it

Recently, the interest for the JCM has received a novel impulse in view of its applications in the fastly developing research area of quantum computing. Indeed, in a quantum computer (QC), information is stored in a ‘quantum register’ composed of N two-level systems representing the quantum bits, or qubits [7]. The storage of data and all the basic operations are implemented by inducing controlled dynamics on the quantum register [8]. Since a QC is a quantum mechanical system, it can perform superpositions of computation operations with a remarkable gain of efficiency with respect to a classical computer. For instance, it can be shown that the problem of factoring large numbers into primes, which takes exponentially increasing time on a classical computer, can be solved in a polynomially increasing time on a QC [9].

Now, a couple of electronic states of an ion can be regarded as a concrete realization of the concept of qubit. Starting from this simple and effective idea, in 1995 Cirac and Zoller [10] proposed a concrete model for a ion-trap computer consisting of N atomic ions trapped in a parabolic potential well. In this model, each ion is regarded as a two-level system oscillating between a ground and an excited state ($|g\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$), so that the number of available qubits equals the number of trapped ions. The control of the quantum degrees of freedom is achieved by addressing the ions with time, frequency and intensity controlled laser beams (see also [11]). One can consider two possible arrangements of the laser beams: each ion individually interacting with a different tightly focalized, possibly zero, laser field (the original Cirac–Zoller scheme) and the whole set of ions interacting with a single laser pulse [12]. The mutual Coulomb interactions allows a communication among the trapped ions. The theoretical description of this physical system is given by a Hamiltonian of the Jaynes-Cummings type — which we will call simply the ‘ N -ion Jaynes-Cummings Hamiltonian’ — namely by a Hamiltonian which can be reduced, via a suitable approximation, to the Hamiltonian of the (N -dimensional) JCM. This kind of approximation is known as the *rotating wave approximation* (RWA) [13]. The standard RWA is essentially a perturbative method since its validity depends on the smallness of a parameter, the Rabi frequency, which is proportional to the intensity of the laser field. This is a severe limit since an intense laser field implies a fast coupling between the two internal energy levels of the trapped ions — i.e. a fast QC — and any operation of a ion-trap QC is performed by an accurate control of the dynamics of the trapped ions.

Hence, to find a solution of the dynamical problem associated with the N -ion Jaynes-Cummings Hamiltonian, both simple and valid for a wide range of the intensity of the laser field, is of great importance for the applications. In the present paper, we have tried to achieve this result. The basic idea is that of performing *first* suitable transformations of the Hamiltonian and only *afterwards* applying the RWA (or any other kind of approximation). Using this strategy, we obtain that the transformed Hamiltonian is formally similar to the initial one, but the new perturbative parameter is not proportional any more to the intensity of the laser field but a simple bounded function of it. Thus the RWA, or any other approximation, once applied to the transformed Hamiltonian, will be scarcely sensitive of the laser intensity. In this sense, we have gone beyond

the *standard* RWA.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2, the Hamiltonian describing the system of trapped ions in interaction with a single laser beam, expressed in a proper set of collective coordinates, is introduced and the standard RWA is resumed. Then, in section 3, suitable transformations are performed on this Hamiltonian in order to obtain a ‘balanced Hamiltonian’ with respect to the laser intensity. At this point, in correspondence to the resonances of the system, one is able to find a good solution to the dynamical problem and this is shown in section 4. In section 5, the results are extended to the general case when each ion interacts with a different laser beam. Eventually, a discussion of the main results obtained is given in section 6.

2 The basic ion trap Hamiltonian

A system of N equal ions of mass μ in a potential trap, with strong confinement along the y and z axes, and weak harmonic binding of frequency ν_1 along the x -axis (the ‘trap axis’), can be described — neglecting the motion of the ions transverse to the trap axis — by a Hamiltonian of the following type (using units in which $\hbar = 1$):

$$\sum_{p=1}^N \nu_p a_p^\dagger a_p + W(\{a_p + a_p^\dagger\}),$$

where $\{a_p\}$ are the annihilation operators associated with a suitable system of collective coordinates, namely the *normal coordinates* of the ion chain, and $W(\{a_p + a_p^\dagger\})$ is the anharmonic component of the ion-ion Coulomb interaction. Precisely, there is a nonsingular real symmetric matrix $[M_{jp}]$ (see, for instance, ref. [14]) such that, denoted by x_j the displacement of the j -th ion from its equilibrium position, the following formula holds:

$$x_j = \sum_{p=1}^N M_{jp}(a_p + a_p^\dagger). \quad (1)$$

Hence, the quantity $x_{jp} \equiv M_{jp}(a_p + a_p^\dagger)$ can be regarded as the displacement of the j -th ion due to the excitation of the p -th mode. The first mode of the ion chain, the *center of mass mode* associated with the operator a_1 , corresponds classically to the ion chain oscillating back and forth rigidly. For $N \geq 2$, the second mode, called the *breathing mode* (or stretch mode), corresponds classically to the situation in which the center of mass is motionless while each ion oscillates with an amplitude proportional to its equilibrium distance from the trap center.

Let us now fix some $j \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ and let us suppose that the j -th ion in the array is addressed by a laser beam of frequency ω_L in a traveling wave configuration. Then, if the j -th ion is regarded as a two-level system oscillating

between a ground $|g\rangle$ and an excited state $|e\rangle$, the ion array will be described by Hamiltonian of the Jaynes-Cummings type, namely

$$H(t) = H_0 + W(\{a_p + a_p^\dagger\}) + H_\downarrow(t), \quad (2)$$

where

$$H_0 := \sum_{p=1}^N \nu_p \hat{n}_p + \frac{1}{2} \omega_{ge} \sigma_z^j, \quad (3)$$

$$H_\downarrow(t) := \Omega_R \left(e^{i\omega_L t} \sigma_-^j \mathcal{D}^{\dagger 2} + e^{-i\omega_L t} \sigma_+^j \mathcal{D}^2 \right), \quad (4)$$

with $\hat{n}_p = a_p^\dagger a_p$ the number operator and $\Omega_R = \wp \mathcal{E}$ the Rabi frequency, $\mathcal{E}$ denoting the intensity of the laser field. Moreover, we have set:

$$\mathcal{D} := \exp \left(\frac{i}{2} \sum_{p=1}^N \eta_{jp} (a_p + a_p^\dagger) \right), \quad (5)$$

where

$$\eta_{jp} := \frac{k_L \cos \phi}{\sqrt{2\mu\nu_1}} M_{jp} \quad (6)$$

— with $\mathbf{k}_L$ the wavevector and ϕ the angle between the x -axis and $\mathbf{k}_L$ — plays the role of a Lamb-Dicke factor. Notice that if $D_p(\alpha)$, $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, is a displacement operator associated with the p -th mode, namely

$$D_p(\alpha) = \exp(\alpha a_p^\dagger - \alpha^* a_p), \quad D_p(\alpha) a_p D_p(\alpha)^\dagger = a_p - \alpha, \quad (7)$$

we have:

$$\mathcal{D} = \prod_{p=1}^N \exp \left(i \frac{\eta_{jp}}{2} (a_p^\dagger + a_p) \right) = \prod_{p=1}^N D_p \left(i \frac{\eta_{jp}}{2} \right). \quad (8)$$

The Hilbert space of the total system ('pointlike' ions + internal degrees of freedom of the j -th ion), namely $\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbb{C}^2$, $\mathcal{H} \equiv L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$, is isomorphic to — and will be identified with — the space $\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}$, since it is often useful to work with operator matrices.

Now, the dynamical problem associated with the time-dependent Hamiltonian $H(t)$ can be reduced to the dynamical problem for a time-independent Hamiltonian. Indeed, switching to the interaction picture with reference Hamiltonian $\frac{1}{2} \omega_L t \sigma_z^j$ and setting

$$R_t := \exp \left(i \frac{1}{2} \omega_L t \sigma_z^j \right), \quad (9)$$

one obtains the time-independent Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{H} &= R_t \left(H(t) - \frac{1}{2} \omega_L \sigma_z^j \right) R_t^\dagger \\ &= \sum_{p=1}^N \nu_p \hat{n}_p + \frac{1}{2} \delta \sigma_z^j + \Omega_R \left(\sigma_-^j \mathcal{D}^{\dagger 2} + \sigma_+^j \mathcal{D}^2 \right) + \widehat{W}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $\delta := \omega_{ge} - \omega_L$ is the ion-laser detuning and we have set $\widehat{W} \equiv W(\{a_p + a_p^\dagger\})$. At this point, assuming that the anharmonic term $\widehat{W}$ can be neglected, the standard *rotating wave approximation* consists in expanding the exponentials that appear in $\mathcal{D}^2$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}^2 &= \prod_{p=1}^N \exp(i\eta_{jp}(a_p^\dagger + a_p)) \\ &= \prod_{p=1}^N \left(1 + i\eta_{jp}(a_p^\dagger + a_p) - \frac{\eta_{jp}^2}{2}(a_p^\dagger + a_p)^2 + \dots \right), \end{aligned}$$

then passing to the interaction picture with reference Hamiltonian

$$\sum_{p=1}^N \nu_p \hat{n}_p + \frac{1}{2} \delta \sigma_z^j,$$

so obtaining the interaction picture Hamiltonian

$$\tilde{H}_{\text{int}}(t) = \left(1 - i \sum_{p=1}^N \eta_{jp} (e^{i\nu_p t} a_p^\dagger + e^{-i\nu_p t} a_p) + \dots \right) e^{-i\delta t} \sigma_-^j + h.c. ,$$

and, finally, retaining only that terms in $\tilde{H}_{\text{int}}(t)$ which are slowly rotating and at most linear in the Lamb-Dicke parameters, that in applications are usually assumed to be small ($\eta_{jp} \ll 1$). Hence, in correspondence to the three types of resonance

$$\omega_{ge} - \omega_L \simeq 0, \quad \omega_{ge} - \omega_L + \nu_k \simeq 0, \quad \omega_{ge} - \omega_L - \nu_k \simeq 0,$$

one obtains respectively the following three types of effective interaction picture Hamiltonian:

$$\Omega_R (\sigma_-^j + \sigma_+^j), \quad i\eta_{jk} \Omega_R (a_k^\dagger \sigma_+^j - a_k \sigma_-^j), \quad i\eta_{jk} \Omega_R (a_k \sigma_+^j - a_k^\dagger \sigma_-^j).$$

The first one, does not couple the internal degrees of freedom of the ions with the vibrational modes, hence it describes a situation which is not useful for the quantum computing applications. The last one is precisely the Jaynes-Cummings Hamiltonian.

We remark that the standard RWA is not always a good approximation. Its validity can be checked by means of a perturbative expansion of the evolution operator, for instance by the Magnus expansion [15]. In particular, it turns out that it does not work in the strong field regime (large Rabi frequency Ω_R), since the Lamb-Dicke factor η_{jk} does not depend on the *intensity* of the laser field but only on its frequency, so that the interaction picture Hamiltonian becomes ‘too large’ for a perturbative treatment.

3 Beyond the standard rotating wave approximation

In order to go beyond the standard rotating wave approximation, we will show that is convenient to apply it *after* that the Hamiltonian $\tilde{H}$ has undergone suitable transformations. Aim of these transformations is to obtain a ‘good Hamiltonian’ which is the sum of a large component having a simple ‘diagonal’ form — i.e. such that its matrix representation in the standard basis

$$\{|n_1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |n_N\rangle \otimes |g\rangle, |n_1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |n_N\rangle \otimes |e\rangle : n_1, \dots, n_N = 1, 2, \dots\} \quad (11)$$

is diagonal — and a small spin-flip component scarcely sensitive of the Rabi frequency Ω_R .

As a first step, extending the transformation used by Moya-Cessa *et al.* [16] for a single ion to the N-ion system, namely the transformation associated with the unitary operator

$$\begin{aligned} T_1 &:= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{D}^\dagger) - \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{D} - \mathcal{D}^\dagger) \sigma_z^j + \mathcal{D} \sigma_+^j - \mathcal{D}^\dagger \sigma_-^j \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}^\dagger & \mathcal{D} \\ -\mathcal{D}^\dagger & \mathcal{D} \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

we are able to ‘linearize’ the exponentials that appear in the spin-flip component of $\tilde{H}$ (see Eq.(10)). Indeed, using the relations

$$T_1 \hat{n}_p T_1^\dagger = \begin{bmatrix} \hat{n}_p + \frac{\eta_{jp}^2}{4} & i \frac{\eta_{jp}}{2} (a_p - a_p^\dagger) \\ i \frac{\eta_{jp}}{2} (a_p - a_p^\dagger) & \hat{n}_p + \frac{\eta_{jp}^2}{4} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

$$T_1 \sigma_z^j T_1^\dagger = -\sigma_x^j, \quad (14)$$

$$T_1 \left(\sigma_-^j \mathcal{D}^{\dagger 2} + \sigma_+^j \mathcal{D}^2 \right) T_1^\dagger = \sigma_z^j, \quad (15)$$

and the fact that T_1 commutes with $\widehat{W}$, one obtains the transformed Hamiltonian

$$\mathfrak{H} = T_1 \left(\tilde{H} - \frac{1}{4} \sum_{p=1}^N \eta_{jp}^2 \nu_p \right) T_1^\dagger = \mathfrak{H}_0 + \mathfrak{W}, \quad (16)$$

where

$$\mathfrak{H}_0 = \sum_{p=1}^N \nu_p \hat{n}_p + \Omega_R \sigma_z^j - \frac{1}{2} \delta \left(\sigma_-^j + \sigma_+^j \right), \quad (17)$$

$$\mathfrak{W} = \widehat{W} + i \sum_{p=1}^N \frac{\eta_{jp} \nu_p}{2} (a_p - a_p^\dagger) \left(\sigma_-^j + \sigma_+^j \right), \quad (18)$$

and we have dropped the unessential constant term $\frac{1}{4} \sum_{p=1}^N \eta_{jp}^2 \nu_p$. Let us notice that the spin-flip component of $\mathfrak{W}$ does not depend on the intensity of the laser field but only on its frequency (through the Lamb-Dicke parameters). On one hand, this fact is positive in the strong field regime. On the other hand, in the weak field regime such component cannot be regarded as a small perturbation. In particular, in the limit for the field intensity going to zero (hence: $\Omega_R \rightarrow 0$), one observes that $\mathfrak{H}$ does not assume a trivial form, as it happens for the Hamiltonians H and $\tilde{H}$. With this problem in mind, let us perform two further transformations. First, the component $\mathfrak{H}_0$ can be easily ‘diagonalized’. Indeed, let us denote by T_2 a spin rotation by the angle θ round the y -axis; namely, let us set

$$T_2 := \begin{bmatrix} \cos \theta/2 & -\sin \theta/2 \\ \sin \theta/2 & \cos \theta/2 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

Now, since

$$T_2 (\sigma_-^j + \sigma_+^j) T_2^\dagger = -\sin \theta \sigma_z^j + \cos \theta (\sigma_-^j + \sigma_+^j), \quad (20)$$

$$T_2 \sigma_z^j T_2^\dagger = \cos \theta \sigma_z^j + \sin \theta (\sigma_-^j + \sigma_+^j), \quad (21)$$

we have that, if the angle $-\pi/2 \leq \theta \leq \pi/2$ verifies the condition

$$\tan \theta = \frac{\Delta}{2}, \quad \Delta := \frac{\omega_{ge} - \omega_L}{\Omega_R} = \frac{\delta}{\Omega_R}, \quad (22)$$

then the following transformations hold:

$$T_2 \mathfrak{H}_0 T_2^\dagger = \sum_{p=1}^N \nu_p \hat{n}_p + \frac{1}{2} \Omega_R \sqrt{4 + \Delta^2} \sigma_z^j, \quad (23)$$

$$\begin{aligned} T_2 \mathfrak{W} T_2^\dagger &= \widehat{W} - i \frac{\Delta}{2\sqrt{4 + \Delta^2}} \sum_{p=1}^N \eta_{jp} \nu_p (a_p - a_p^\dagger) \sigma_z^j \\ &+ i \frac{1}{\sqrt{4 + \Delta^2}} \sum_{p=1}^N \eta_{jp} \nu_p (a_p - a_p^\dagger) (\sigma_-^j + \sigma_+^j), \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

Eventually, reorganizing the various terms, we have:

$$\widehat{H} := T_2 \mathfrak{H} T_2^\dagger = \widehat{H}_0 + \widehat{H}_\uparrow + \widehat{W}, \quad (25)$$

where

$$\widehat{H}_0 := \sum_{p=1}^N \nu_p \hat{n}_p + \left(\frac{\Omega_R}{2} \sqrt{4 + \Delta^2} - \frac{i\Delta}{2\sqrt{4 + \Delta^2}} \sum_{p=1}^N \eta_{jp} \nu_p (a_p - a_p^\dagger) \right) \sigma_z^j, \quad (26)$$

$$\widehat{H}_\uparrow := \frac{i}{\sqrt{4 + \Delta^2}} \sum_{p=1}^N \left(\eta_{jp} \nu_p (a_p - a_p^\dagger) (\sigma_-^j + \sigma_+^j) \right). \quad (27)$$

At this point, in the limit for the laser intensity going to zero, the small spin-flip component $\hat{H}_\uparrow$ of $\hat{H}$ cancels, as it should. The large component $\hat{H}_0$ still need to be simplified, since it contains a ‘nondiagonal’ term (with respect to the standard basis).

To this aim, let us consider the unitary operator

$$\begin{aligned} T_3 &:= \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{D}(\{\alpha_p\}) + \mathcal{D}(\{\alpha_p\})^\dagger) + \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{D}(\{\alpha_p\}) - \mathcal{D}(\{\alpha_p\})^\dagger) \sigma_z^j \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{D}(\{\alpha_p\}) & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{D}(\{\alpha_p\})^\dagger \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

with $\mathcal{D}(\{\alpha_p\}) := \prod_{p=1}^N D_p(\alpha_p)$, where $\{\alpha_p\}$ is a set of c-numbers to be fixed in a suitable way. Then, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} T_3 \hat{H}_0 T_3^\dagger &= \sum_{p=1}^N \nu_p (\hat{n}_p - (\alpha_p^* a_p + \alpha_p a_p^\dagger) \sigma_z^j + |\alpha_p|^2) + \frac{1}{2} \Omega_R \sqrt{4 + \Delta^2} \sigma_z^j \\ &\quad - i \frac{\Delta}{2\sqrt{4 + \Delta^2}} \sum_{p=1}^N \eta_{jp} \nu_p ((a_p - a_p^\dagger) \sigma_z^j - (\alpha_p - \alpha_p^*)). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if we assume that

$$\alpha_p = i \frac{\Delta}{2\sqrt{4 + \Delta^2}} \eta_{jp}, \quad (29)$$

we get:

$$T_3 \hat{H}_0 T_3^\dagger = \sum_{p=1}^N \nu_p \hat{n}_p + \frac{1}{2} \Omega_R \sqrt{4 + \Delta^2} \sigma_z^j - \frac{\Delta^2}{4(4 + \Delta^2)} \sum_{p=1}^N \eta_{jp} \nu_p, \quad (30)$$

namely the ‘diagonalized’ expression that we wished to obtain. Moreover, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} T_3 (a_p - a_p^\dagger) (\sigma_-^j + \sigma_+^j) T_3^\dagger &= (a_p - a_p^\dagger) (\sigma_-^j \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\dagger 2} + \sigma_+^j \check{\mathcal{D}}^2) \\ &\quad + i \frac{\Delta}{\sqrt{4 + \Delta^2}} \eta_{jp} (\sigma_-^j \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\dagger 2} - \sigma_+^j \check{\mathcal{D}}^2), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where

$$\check{\mathcal{D}} := \prod_{p=1}^N D_p \left(i \frac{\check{\eta}_{jp}}{2} \right), \quad \check{\eta}_{jp} := \frac{\Delta}{\sqrt{4 + \Delta^2}} \eta_{jp}. \quad (32)$$

Notice that, since

$$\lim_{\Omega_R \rightarrow 0} \check{\eta}_{jp} = \text{sign}(\delta) \eta_{jp}, \quad (\text{weak field limit}) \quad (33)$$

$$\lim_{\Omega_R \rightarrow \infty} \check{\eta}_{jp} = 0, \quad (\text{strong field limit}) \quad (34)$$

$\check{\eta}_{jp}$ behaves as a ‘laser intensity balanced’ Lamb-Dicke parameter. Hence, we have the transformed Hamiltonian

$$\check{H} := T_3 \left(\hat{H} + \frac{\Delta^2}{4(4 + \Delta^2)} \sum_{p=1}^N \eta_{jp}^2 \nu_p \right) T_3^\dagger = \check{H}_0 + \check{H}_\uparrow + \widehat{W}, \quad (35)$$

where again we have dropped the unessential constant term and we have set

$$\check{H}_0 := \sum_{p=1}^N \nu_p \hat{n}_p + \frac{1}{2} \check{\delta} \sigma_z^j, \quad (36)$$

with

$$\check{\delta} := \sqrt{4\Omega_R^2 + \delta^2}, \quad (37)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \check{H}_\uparrow := & \frac{i}{\Delta} \sum_{p=1}^N \check{\eta}_{jp} \nu_p (a_p - a_p^\dagger) \left(\sigma_-^j \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\dagger 2} + \sigma_+^j \check{\mathcal{D}}^2 \right) \\ & - \frac{1}{\Delta} \sum_{p=1}^N \check{\eta}_{jp}^2 \nu_p \left(\sigma_-^j \check{\mathcal{D}}^{\dagger 2} - \sigma_+^j \check{\mathcal{D}}^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

The new Hamiltonian $\check{H}$ enjoys very nice properties. The first point is that the main component $\check{H}_0$ has a very simple diagonal form. It only differs from the main component of $\hat{H}$ for the constant factor

$$\frac{1}{2} \check{\delta} = \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{4\Omega_R^2 + (\omega_{ge} - \omega_L)^2}$$

of σ_z^j instead of

$$\frac{1}{2} \delta = \frac{1}{2} (\omega_{ge} - \omega_L).$$

Thus, we have obtained an effective ion-laser detuning $\check{\delta}$ which will introduce a correction into the standard condition for resonances (obviously, the standard formula is recovered in the weak field limit).

The second — but not less important — point is that the spin-flip component has a good behaviour in both the weak and strong field regime; indeed:

$$\lim_{\Omega_R \rightarrow 0} \check{H}_\uparrow = 0 \quad (39)$$

and, since $\lim_{\Delta \rightarrow 0} \check{\eta}_{jp}/\Delta = \eta_{jp}/2$,

$$\lim_{\Omega_R \rightarrow \infty} \check{H}_\uparrow = \frac{i}{2} \sum_{p=1}^N \eta_{jp} \nu_p (a_p - a_p^\dagger) \left(\sigma_-^j + \sigma_+^j \right). \quad (40)$$

Moreover, if the Lamb-Dicke parameters $\{\eta_{jp}\}$ are assumed to be small, $\eta_{jp} \ll 1$, since

$$\begin{aligned} |\check{\eta}_{jp}| &\leq |\eta_{jp}| \Rightarrow \check{\eta}_{jp} \check{D}^2 \simeq \check{\eta}_{jp}, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{4 + \Delta^2}} &> \frac{\Delta}{4 + \Delta^2} \Rightarrow \frac{1}{\Delta} \check{\eta}_{jp} \gg \frac{1}{\Delta} \eta_{jp}^2, \end{aligned}$$

one has that, *for any intensity of the laser field*,

$$\check{H}_{\uparrow} \simeq \frac{i}{\Delta} \sum_{p=1}^N \check{\eta}_{jp} \nu_p (a_p - a_p^\dagger) (\sigma_-^j + \sigma_+^j). \quad (41)$$

4 The evolution operator

In this section, we will exploit the transformations introduced above in order to give a suitable approximate expression of the evolution operator $U(H; t, t_0)$ associated with the ion trap Hamiltonian H :

$$i \frac{d}{dt} U(H; t, t_0) = H(t) U(H; t, t_0), \quad U(H; t_0, t_0) = \text{Id}. \quad (42)$$

Parenthetically, let us notice that, if

$$\bar{H}(t) = H_0 + \widehat{W} + \Theta(t) H_{\uparrow}(t), \quad (43)$$

where Θ denotes the Heaviside theta function, i.e. if $\bar{H}$ is the Hamiltonian describing the situation in which the interaction with the laser field is turned on at $t = 0$, then, for $t_0 < 0 < t$, we have simply:

$$U(\bar{H}; t, t_0) = U(H; t, 0) \exp \left(i(H_0 + \widehat{W})t_0 \right). \quad (44)$$

First, we will assume that the ions are not too tightly packed along the trap axis so that we can make the approximation

$$\check{H} \simeq \check{H}_0 + \check{H}_{\uparrow}, \quad (45)$$

namely we can neglect the anharmonic component $\widehat{W}$ of the ion-ion potential. This assumption, whose accuracy can be estimated calculating the equilibrium positions of the ions in the trap (see [14]), is also necessary in order to prevent the ion chain from adopting a zig-zag configuration [17]. Next, we can pass to the interaction picture with reference Hamiltonian $\check{H}_0$. Then, if we set

$$V_t := \exp \left(i \check{H}_0 t \right), \quad (46)$$

the effective Hamiltonian of the system becomes:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}(t) &:= V_t \check{H}_\downarrow V_t^\dagger \\
&= \frac{i}{\Delta} \sum_{p=1}^N \check{\eta}_{jp} \nu_p \left(e^{-i\omega_p^- t} a_p \sigma_+^j \check{\mathcal{D}}_t - e^{i\omega_p^- t} a_p^\dagger \sigma_-^j \check{\mathcal{D}}_t^\dagger \right) \\
&\quad + \frac{i}{\Delta} \sum_{p=1}^N \check{\eta}_{jp} \nu_p \left(e^{-i\omega_p^+ t} a_p \sigma_-^j \check{\mathcal{D}}_t^\dagger - e^{i\omega_p^+ t} a_p^\dagger \sigma_+^j \check{\mathcal{D}}_t \right) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{\Delta} \sum_{p=1}^N \check{\eta}_{jp}^2 \nu_p \left(e^{-i\check{\delta} t} \sigma_-^j \check{\mathcal{D}}_t^\dagger - e^{i\check{\delta} t} \sigma_+^j \check{\mathcal{D}}_t \right), \tag{47}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have set

$$\omega_p^\pm := \nu_p \pm \check{\delta} = \nu_p \pm \sqrt{4\Omega_R^2 + (\omega_{ge} - \omega_L)^2}, \tag{48}$$

and

$$\check{\mathcal{D}}_t := \prod_{p=1}^N \exp \left(i\check{\eta}_{jp} \left(e^{-i\nu_p t} a_p + e^{i\nu_p t} a_p^\dagger \right) \right). \tag{49}$$

In correspondence to the resonance $\omega_k^- \simeq 0$, if $\eta_{jk} \ll 1$, applying the RWA, one finds that

$$\mathcal{H}(t) \simeq \frac{i}{\Delta} \check{\eta}_{jk} \nu_k \left(a_k \sigma_+^j - a_k^\dagger \sigma_-^j \right) \tag{50}$$

and hence:

$$U(\mathcal{H}; t, t_0) \simeq \exp \left(\frac{\check{\eta}_{jk} \nu_k}{\Delta} (t - t_0) \left(a_k \sigma_+^j - a_k^\dagger \sigma_-^j \right) \right). \tag{51}$$

Then, since

$$\left(a_k \sigma_+^j - a_k^\dagger \sigma_-^j \right)^{2m} = (-1)^m \left(a_k a_k^\dagger \sigma_+^j \sigma_-^j + a_k^\dagger a_k \sigma_-^j \sigma_+^j \right)^m,$$

it follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
U(\mathcal{H}; t, t_0) &\simeq \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^m}{2m!} \left(\frac{\check{\eta}_{jk} \nu_k}{\Delta} (t - t_0) \right)^{2m} \begin{bmatrix} (a_k a_k^\dagger)^m & 0 \\ 0 & (a_k^\dagger a_k)^m \end{bmatrix} \\
&\quad + \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^m}{(2m+1)!} \left(\frac{\check{\eta}_{jk} \nu_k}{\Delta} (t - t_0) \right)^{2m+1} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & (a_k a_k^\dagger)^m a_k \\ -(a_k^\dagger a_k)^m a_k^\dagger & 0 \end{bmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, within the approximation (50), the evolution operator $U(\mathcal{H}; t, t_0)$ has the following form:

$$\begin{bmatrix} \cos \left(\frac{\check{\eta}_{jk} \nu_k}{\Delta} (t - t_0) \sqrt{\hat{n}_k + 1} \right) & \frac{\sin \left(\frac{\check{\eta}_{jk} \nu_k}{\Delta} (t - t_0) \sqrt{\hat{n}_k + 1} \right)}{\sqrt{\hat{n}_k + 1}} a_k \\ -\frac{\sin \left(\frac{\check{\eta}_{jk} \nu_k}{\Delta} (t - t_0) \sqrt{\hat{n}_k} \right)}{\sqrt{\hat{n}_k}} a_k^\dagger & \cos \left(\frac{\check{\eta}_{jk} \nu_k}{\Delta} (t - t_0) \sqrt{\hat{n}_k} \right) \end{bmatrix}. \tag{52}$$

At this point, we will use the the transformations we performed on the original Hamiltonian H in order to obtain the expression of the evolution operator $U(H; t, t_0)$. Let us resume them:

$$H(t) \xrightarrow{-\rightarrow} \tilde{H} \xrightarrow{T_1} \mathfrak{H} \xrightarrow{T_2} \hat{H} \xrightarrow{T_3} \check{H} \simeq \check{H}_0 + \check{H}_\uparrow \xrightarrow{-\rightarrow} \mathcal{C}(t),$$

where the dashed arrows denote the switching to an interaction picture. Now, taking care of the difference between genuine unitary transformations of the Hamiltonian and Dirac (interaction picture) decompositions of the evolution operator, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} U(H; t, t_0) &= R_t^\dagger \exp\left(-i(t-t_0)\tilde{H}\right) \\ &= R_t^\dagger T_1^\dagger \exp\left(-i(t-t_0)\mathfrak{H}\right) T_1 \\ &= R_t^\dagger T_1^\dagger T_2^\dagger \exp\left(-i(t-t_0)\hat{H}\right) T_2 T_1 \\ &= R_t^\dagger T_1^\dagger T_2^\dagger T_3^\dagger \exp\left(-i(t-t_0)\check{H}\right) T_3 T_2 T_1. \end{aligned}$$

Then, using the approximation $\check{H} \simeq \check{H}_0 + \check{H}_\uparrow$, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} U(H; t, t_0) &\simeq R_t^\dagger T_\Delta^\dagger \exp\left(-i(t-t_0)\check{H}_0 + \check{H}_\uparrow\right) T_\Delta \\ &= R_t^\dagger T_\Delta^\dagger V_t^\dagger U(\mathcal{C}; t, t_0) T_\Delta, \end{aligned} \tag{53}$$

where we have set

$$\begin{aligned} T_\Delta &:= T_3 T_2 T_1 \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \varkappa_\Delta^+ \prod_{p=1}^N D_p(i\epsilon_\Delta^- \eta_{jp}) & \varkappa_\Delta^- \prod_{p=1}^N D_p(i\epsilon_\Delta^+ \eta_{jp}) \\ -\varkappa_\Delta^- \prod_{p=1}^N D_p(i\epsilon_\Delta^+ \eta_{jp})^\dagger & \varkappa_\Delta^+ \prod_{p=1}^N D_p(i\epsilon_\Delta^- \eta_{jp})^\dagger \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} \varkappa_\Delta^+ \prod_{p=1}^N D_p(i(\check{\eta}_{jp} - \eta_{jp})/2) & \varkappa_\Delta^- \prod_{p=1}^N D_p(i(\check{\eta}_{jp} + \eta_{jp})/2) \\ -\varkappa_\Delta^- \prod_{p=1}^N D_p(i(\check{\eta}_{jp} + \eta_{jp})/2)^\dagger & \varkappa_\Delta^+ \prod_{p=1}^N D_p(i(\check{\eta}_{jp} - \eta_{jp})/2)^\dagger \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \tag{54}$$

with

$$\varkappa_\Delta^\pm = \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{4+\Delta^2}}} \pm \text{sign}(\Delta) \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{4+\Delta^2}}}, \tag{55}$$

$$\epsilon_\Delta^\pm = \frac{\Delta}{2\sqrt{4+\Delta^2}} \pm \frac{1}{2}. \tag{56}$$

5 Extension: N laser beams

The results obtained above can be easily generalized to the case when each ion in the trap interacts with a laser beam at the same time. Notice that the case when all the ions are interacting simultaneously with the same laser beam will be included as a particular case.

If each ion interacts with a laser beam, then the internal degrees of freedom of all the ions will be involved in the dynamics of the system. Hence, the Hilbert space of the model will be

$$\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{2N} \cong \overbrace{(\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H}) \otimes \dots \otimes (\mathcal{H} \oplus \mathcal{H})}^N,$$

where $\mathcal{H} \equiv L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)$, while the Hamiltonian will be now the following:

$$\begin{aligned} H(t) &= \sum_{p=1}^N \nu_p \hat{n}_p + \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{1}{2} \omega_{ge} \sigma_z^j \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^N \Omega_R^j \left(e^{-i(\omega_L^j t + \varphi^j)} \sigma_+^j \mathcal{D}_j^2 + e^{i(\omega_L^j t + \varphi^j)} \sigma_-^j \mathcal{D}_j^{\dagger 2} \right) + \widehat{W}, \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where Ω_R^j, ω_L^j are respectively the Rabi and the laser frequency associated with the j -th laser beam (namely the one in interaction with the j -th ion), φ^j is an initial phase, and we have set

$$\mathcal{D}_j^2 := \prod_{p=1}^N \exp(i\eta_{jp} (a_p^\dagger + a_p)) = \prod_{p=1}^N D_p^2 \left(i \frac{\eta_{jp}}{2} \right), \quad (58)$$

$[\eta_{jp}] = \left[\left(k_L^j \cos \phi_j / \sqrt{2\mu\nu_1} \right) M_{jp} \right]$ being a ‘Lamb-Dicke matrix’. Let us perform on the Hamiltonian $H(t)$ the following transformations:

$$H(t) \xrightarrow{R_t} \widetilde{H} \xrightarrow{T_{\{\Delta_j\}}} \check{H} = \check{H}_0 + \check{H}_\uparrow + \widehat{W} \simeq \check{H}_0 + \check{H}_\uparrow \xrightarrow{V_t} \mathcal{H}(t),$$

where we recall that the dashed arrows denote a passage to an interaction picture and we have:

$$R_t := \bigotimes_{j=1}^N \exp \left(\frac{i}{2} \left(\omega_L^j t + \varphi^j \right) \sigma_z^j \right), \quad (59)$$

$$T_{\{\Delta_j\}} := \bigotimes_{j=1}^N \begin{bmatrix} \varkappa_{\Delta_j}^+ \prod_{p=1}^N D_p(i\epsilon_{\Delta_j}^- \eta_{jp}) & \varkappa_{\Delta_j}^- \prod_{p=1}^N D_p(i\epsilon_{\Delta_j}^+ \eta_{jp}) \\ -\varkappa_{\Delta_j}^- \prod_{p=1}^N D_p(i\epsilon_{\Delta_j}^+ \eta_{jp})^\dagger & \varkappa_{\Delta_j}^+ \prod_{p=1}^N D_p(i\epsilon_{\Delta_j}^- \eta_{jp})^\dagger \end{bmatrix}, \quad (60)$$

with

$$\Delta_j := \frac{\omega_{ge} - \omega_L^j}{\Omega_R^j}, \quad (61)$$

$$\varkappa_{\Delta_j}^\pm := \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{4 + \Delta_j^2}}} \pm \text{sign}(\Delta_j) \sqrt{\frac{1}{4} - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{4 + \Delta_j^2}}}, \quad (62)$$

$$\epsilon_{\Delta_j}^\pm := \frac{\Delta_j}{2\sqrt{4 + \Delta_j^2}} \pm \frac{1}{2}. \quad (63)$$

Accordingly, the expression of the transformed Hamiltonian $\check{H} = \check{H}_0 + \check{H}_\dagger$ is given by

$$\check{H}_0 = \sum_{p=1}^N \nu_p \hat{n}_p + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N \check{\delta}_j \sigma_z^j, \quad (64)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \check{H}_\dagger &= \sum_{j,p=1}^N \frac{i}{\Delta_j} \check{\eta}_{jp} \nu_p (a_p - a_p^\dagger) \left(\sigma_-^j \check{\mathcal{D}}_j^{\dagger 2} + \sigma_+^j \check{\mathcal{D}}_j^2 \right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{j,p=1}^N \frac{1}{\Delta_j} \check{\eta}_{jp}^2 \nu_p \left(\sigma_-^j \check{\mathcal{D}}_j^{\dagger 2} - \sigma_+^j \check{\mathcal{D}}_j^2 \right), \end{aligned} \quad (65)$$

with

$$\check{\delta}_j := \sqrt{4\Omega_R^{j2} - (\omega_{ge} - \omega_L^j)^2}, \quad \check{\eta}_{jp} := \frac{\Delta_j}{\sqrt{4 + \Delta_j^2}} \eta_{jp}, \quad (66)$$

$$\check{\mathcal{D}}_j := \prod_{p=1}^N D_p \left(i \frac{\check{\eta}_{jp}}{2} \right). \quad (67)$$

Then, we have

$$V_t := \exp \left(i \check{H}_0 t \right) \quad (68)$$

and the expression of interaction picture Hamiltonian $\mathcal{J}$ in the general case is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{J}(t) &= V_t \check{H}_\dagger V_t^\dagger \\ &= \sum_{j,p=1}^N \frac{i}{\Delta_j} \check{\eta}_{jp} \nu_p \left(e^{-i\omega_{j,p}^- t} a_p \sigma_+^j \check{\mathcal{D}}_{j;t} - e^{i\omega_{j,p}^- t} a_p^\dagger \sigma_-^j \check{\mathcal{D}}_{j;t}^\dagger \right) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j,p=1}^N \frac{i}{\Delta_j} \check{\eta}_{jp} \nu_p \left(e^{-i\omega_{j,p}^+ t} a_p \sigma_-^j \check{\mathcal{D}}_{j;t}^\dagger - e^{i\omega_{j,p}^+ t} a_p^\dagger \sigma_+^j \check{\mathcal{D}}_{j;t} \right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{j,p=1}^N \frac{1}{\Delta_j} \check{\eta}_{jp}^2 \nu_p \left(e^{-i\check{\delta}_j t} \sigma_-^j \check{\mathcal{D}}_{j;t}^\dagger - e^{i\check{\delta}_j t} \sigma_+^j \check{\mathcal{D}}_{j;t} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (69)$$

where we have set

$$\omega_{j,p}^\pm := \nu_p \pm \check{\delta}_j = \nu_p \pm \sqrt{4\Omega_R^{j2} + (\omega_{ge} - \omega_L^j)^2} \quad (70)$$

and

$$\check{\mathcal{D}}_{j;t} := \prod_{p=1}^N \exp \left(i \check{\eta}_{jp} \left(e^{-i\nu_p t} a_p + e^{i\nu_p t} a_p^\dagger \right) \right). \quad (71)$$

Thus, a resonance arises in the interaction picture Hamiltonian $\mathcal{J}$ if the condition $\omega_{j,p}^- = 0$ is satisfied for some $j, p \in \{1, \dots, N\}$. Notice that up to N

resonances may arise simultaneously, with up to N vibrational modes being involved. The evolution operator, in the RWA, is given by a tensor product of identity operators and single mode evolution operators like (52) (one for each resonant mode).

6 Discussion

A very frequent problem in quantum mechanics is to find an approximate expression of the evolution operator associated with a Hamiltonian of the following type:

$$H(t) = H_0 + H_{\uparrow}(t; \{\varepsilon_k\}),$$

where H_0 is explicitly diagonalizable, in the sense that it admits a complete set of known eigenvectors, and $\{\varepsilon_k\}$ is a set of adjustable parameters. Typically, $H_{\uparrow}(t; \{\varepsilon_k\}) = 0$, for $t < 0$, and the initial ($t = 0$) state vector of the system is an eigenvector of H_0 (namely, for $t < 0$, a stationary state of H). Then, a perturbative treatment of the problem is possible only if $H_{\uparrow}(t; \{\varepsilon_k\})$ is ‘comparatively small’ with respect to H_0 . Usually, such condition holds only for a restricted range of the adjustable parameters $\{\varepsilon_k\}$. This turns out to be a severe limit in many remarkable applications.

A problem of this sort affects the standard RWA treatment of a Hamiltonian of the Jaynes-Cummings type describing a set of linearly trapped ions in interaction with laser beams, if the laser intensity is not small. In the present paper, we have shown that such problem can be bypassed. This is accomplished by performing suitable transformations of the Hamiltonian. These transformations allow us to obtain an interaction picture Hamiltonian which is *stable* with respect to the intensity of the laser field. Indeed, recalling formula (47) (or (69)), one observes that the dependence on the Rabi frequency is contained in the factors

$$\frac{1}{\Delta} \check{\eta}_{jp} = \frac{\Omega_R}{\sqrt{4\Omega_R^2 + \delta^2}} \eta_{jp},$$

with $0 \leq \left| \frac{1}{\Delta} \check{\eta}_{jp} \right| \leq \frac{1}{2} |\eta_{jp}|$, and

$$\frac{1}{\Delta} \check{\eta}_{jp}^2 = \frac{\Omega_R \delta}{4\Omega_R^2 + \delta^2} \eta_{jp}^2,$$

with $0 \leq \left| \frac{1}{\Delta} \check{\eta}_{jp}^2 \right| \leq \frac{1}{4} \eta_{jp}^2$. Hence the validity of any approximate expression of the evolution operator, in particular the one obtained using the RWA, will be scarcely influenced by the intensity of the laser field.

There are three further points that should be highlighted. First, a simple field-intensity corrected condition for resonances arises in a natural way from our procedure, namely (in the single laser beam case):

$$\nu_p - \check{\delta} = 0, \quad \check{\delta} = \sqrt{4\Omega_R^2 + (\omega_{ge} - \omega_L)^2}.$$

Observe that the corrected detuning $\check{\delta}$ is always nonnegative, differently from the standard ion-laser detuning δ . Thus, both positive- δ and negative- δ resonances will be associated with terms of the type

$$a_p \sigma_+^j, \quad a_p^\dagger \sigma_-^j,$$

in the interaction picture Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}$, hence formally treated in the same way, differently from the standard RWA.

Second, one can check that the action on the standard basis (11) of the unitary operator T_Δ (or $T_{\{\Delta_j\}}$) is easily computable. This means simple explicit expressions for the time evolution of state vectors. A detailed analysis of the main features of these expressions and, in particular, of the typical ‘collapse and revival’ phenomenon will be presented in a subsequent paper [21].

Third, the nonharmonic component $\widehat{W}$ of the ion-ion interaction is not modified by any of the transformations performed. To show this we have retained it up to formula (45), where it is neglected. Hence its relatively simple form is not corrupted and it can be taken into account as a perturbation in a more accurate treatment. Again, such a treatment will be presented in a subsequent paper [22].

Other interesting unitary transformations have been presented, with different aims, in the literature [18] [19] [20], apart from the previously cited one [16]. They do not seem to share the same properties with the one presented here.

Acknowledgements

The main results of this paper were presented by one of the authors (P. Aniello) during the ‘Wigner Centennial Conference’ held in Pécs, Hungary (8-12 July 2002). He wishes to thank the organizers for the kind hospitality.

References

- [1] E. T. Jaynes and F. W. Cummings, *Proc. IEEE* **51** (1963), p. 89.
- [2] B. W. Shore and P. L. Knight, *Journ. of Mod. Optics* **40** (1993), p. 1195.
- [3] D. J. Wineland, J. J. Bollinger, W. M. Itano, F. L. Moore and D. J. Heinzen, *Phys. Rev. A* **50** (1994), p. 67.
- [4] J. J. Bollinger, W. M. Itano, D. J. Wineland and D. J. Heinzen, *Phys. Rev. D* **54** (1996), p. R4649.
- [5] J. H. Eberly, N. B. Narozhny, J. J. Sanchez-Mondragon, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **44**, (1980) p. 1323.
- [6] M. Fleischhauer, W. P. Schleich, *Phys. Rev. A* **47**, (1993) p. 4258.
- [7] S. L. Braunstein, A. Mann and M. Revzen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68** (1992), p. 3259.

- [8] S. Y. Kilin, *Progress in Optics* **42** (2001) p. 1.
- [9] P. W. Shor, in *Proceedings of the 35-th Annual Symposium on the FOCS*, edited by S. Goldwasser, IEEE Computer Society Press (1994), p. 124.
- [10] J. I. Cirac and P. Zoller, *Phys. Rev. Letters* **74** (1995), p. 4091.
- [11] T. Pellizzari, S. A. Gardiner, J. I. Cirac and P. Zoller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75** (1995), p. 3788.
- [12] Klaus Mølmer and Anders Sørensen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82** (1999), p. 1835; Daniel Jonathan and Martin B. Plenio, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87** (2001), 127901.
- [13] W. P. Schleich, *Quantum Optics in Phase Space*, WILEY-VCH (2001).
- [14] D. F. V. James, *Appl. Phys. B* **66** (1998), p. 181.
- [15] G. Dattoli, J. C. Gagliardo, A. Torre, *Rivista del Nuovo Cimento* **11** (1988), p. 1.
- [16] H. Moya-Cessa, A. Vidiella-Barranco, J. A. Roversi, Dagoberto S. Freitas, S. M. Dutra, *Phys. Rev. A* **59** (1999), p. 2518.
- [17] J. P. Schiffer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70** (1993), p. 818.
- [18] D. Jonathan, M. B. Plenio and P. L. Knight, *Phys. Rev. A* **62** (2000), 042307.
- [19] L. M. Arévalo Aguilar and H. Moya-Cessa, *Phys. Rev. A* **65** (2002), 053413.
- [20] O. E. Müstecaploglou, L. You, *Phys. Rev. A* **65** (2002), 033412.
- [21] P. Aniello, A. Porzio, S. Solimeno, “Collapses and revivals in the N -ion Jaynes-Cummings model”, *in preparation*.
- [22] P. Aniello, V. Man’ko, G. Marmo, A. Porzio, S. Solimeno, F. Zaccaria, “A unified approach to slow and fast N -ion quantum computers”, *in preparation*.